TLC

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,816	02/05/2002	Felix G.T.I. Andrew	MSFT-1210(126608.2)	2569

7590 10/17/2006

Woodcock Washburn LLP
46th Floor
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
REILLY, SEAN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/068,816	ANDREW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean Reilly	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 17-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15, 17-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Another Examiner has been assigned to this application.

This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration filed on July 28, 2006. Claims 1-15 and 17-20 are presented for further examination. None of the claims have been amended.

Response to Arguments

1. In response to Applicant's request for reconsideration filed on July 28, 2006, the following factual arguments are noted:

a. Toga discloses that content is sent to either the original requesting location OR a single alternate location that is different from the original requesting location.

In considering (a), Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument. Applicant asserts that Toga discloses that content is sent to either the original requesting location OR a single alternate location that is different from the original requesting location but not to both locations as claimed. Examiner disagrees. Applicant has failed to embrace the full breadth of Toga's teachings. Note the use of the term location in Applicant's arguments is understood to be synonymous with computer in the context of Applicant's claims. As Applicant points out Toga can send requested content to an original requesting location or to an alternate location (Toga Col 2, lines 54-58). Applicant has interpreted the use of the conjunction OR to require sending to only the requesting location or to only another location different from the requesting location. Examiner notes that Applicant's claims do not require the content to be sent to the

requesting location and another location concurrently in response to a single request as applicant appears to assert. Rather, the claims merely require the requested content to be received at by the requesting location and another location at some point. Toga clearly disclosed that a requesting location and another location receives requested content. For instance see Toga Col 5, lines 33-42, where both a third party requester (i.e. requesting location) and another recipient (i.e. another location different from the requesting location) receive specific data. Thus, Toga clearly disclosed sending requested content to both an original requesting location and an alternate location. If Applicant intends for the claims to require requested content to be sent to the requesting location and another location concurrently in response to a single request then Applicant is encouraged to place such a limitation into the claims. Such an amendment would most likely overcome the Toga reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Toga US patent 5,987,504.

As per claim 1, Toga teaches a server computer (fig.2 server 50) comprising:

a communication interface to a communication network for establishing a first communication link (fig.2 link 42) between the server and a host client computer (fig.2 client 40) and a second communication link (link 62) between the server and a slave client computer (client 60); and

a shared view engine for receiving via the first communication link an identifier that identifies the slave client computer (col.3 lines 48-60 "destination storage address") and a locator corresponding to content on the server (col.3 lines 30-38 "file to be access"), and for causing the server to deliver via the communication interface to the host client computer and to the slave computer the content corresponding to the locator (col.3 line 60 to col.4 line 4. col.5 lines 33-42).

As per claim 2, Toga teaches the locator is a URL (col.2 line 37).

As per claim 3, it is inherent that the network interface enables the severs to establish link to any of a plurality of client computers on the network.

As per claim 4, Toga teaches providing cookie data associated with the content (col.3 lines 39-55 - data type, size and "if-modified-Since").

As per claim 5, Toga teaches the share view engine determine from the cookie data whether to download the content to the host client computer and the slave client computer (col.4 lines 5-11).

As per claim 6, it is inherent that the server's network interface can be use for establishing connections to plural slave client computer.

As per claim 7, Toga teaches establishing a second communication link (fig.2 link 62) based on the identifier.

As per claim 8, Toga teaches the server receiving the locator from a browser residing on the host client computer (col.3 line 25-30).

As per claims 9 and 11, Toga teaches the network being Internet and wide area network (col.1 line 19).

As per claims 13-14, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 1 above. It is apparent that the server can receive content locator request from the first and the second computers.

As per claim 15, Toga teaches a client computer comprising:

a communication link interface for establishing communication link to a server (fig.2 link 42);

a shared view engine (browser) for receiving content from the server

wherein the shared view engine is for providing via the communication link to the server an identifier of the remote client computer (col.3 lines 48-60 "destination storage address") and a locator corresponding to content on the server (col.3 lines 30-38 "file to be access").

As per claims 17-19, they are method claim corresponding to functions performed in claims 1, and 5-7. Hence, claims 17-19 are rejected under similar rationales as stated for claims 1 and 5-7 above.

As per claim 20, it is a computer product with instruction performing the functions in claim 1. Hence, claim 20 is rejected under similar rationale as stated for claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> *(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been*

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toga US patent 5,987,504.

As per claim 10 and 12, Toga does not specifically disclose the network being an intranet or a LAN. Whether the network is a WAN, LAN, Internet or Intranet does not affect the functionality of the system. Hence, serving web page within an intranet or LAN is would have been obvious variation from the teaching of Toga. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to providing web page information via LAN or intranet because it would have provided employees easy, private access to corporate information.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record, in PTO-892 form, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Reilly whose telephone number is 571-272-4228. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 10, 2006

KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER